

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO (CSBN 44332)
United States Attorney

BRIAN J. STRETCH (CSBN 163173)
Chief, Criminal Division

SUSAN KNIGHT (CSBN 209013)
Assistant United States Attorney

JENNIFER GRIFFITH
Law Clerk

150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 535-5036
FAX: (408) 535-5066
jennifer.a.griffith@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOHN HENRY BRUNO,

Defendant.

No. CR 08-00041 RS

STIPULATION AND ~~PROPOSED~~
ORDER EXCLUDING TIME

SAN JOSE VENUE

On March 20, 2008, the parties in the above-captioned case appeared before the Court for a status hearing. Assistant Federal Public Defender Nicholas P. Humy and the government agreed that the Court schedule the case for arraignment and possible disposition on April 10, 2008. Assistant Federal Public Defender Humy then requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from March 20, 2008 until April 10, 2008 for defense preparation. The government, through Jennifer Griffith, Law Clerk for the United States Attorney's Office, agreed to the exclusion. The undersigned parties agree and stipulate that an exclusion of time is appropriate

1 based on the defendant's need for effective preparation.

3 SO STIPULATED:

JOSEPH P. RUSSONIELLO
United States Attorney

5 DATED: 3/20/08

/s/
SUSAN KNIGHT
Assistant United States Attorney

7 DATED: 3/20/08

/s/
NICHOLAS P. HUMY
Assistant Federal Public Defender

11 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded
12 under the Speedy Trial Act from March 20, 2008 to April 10, 2008. The Court finds, based on
13 the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested continuance
14 outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The failure to grant
15 the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary for effective
16 preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage
17 of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made under 18
18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

19 SO ORDERED.

21 DATED: 3/24/08


RICHARD SEEBORG
United States Magistrate Judge